

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF QUEENS

THOMAS MULHALL,

X

Index No.:
Date Purchased:

SUMMONS

Plaintiff,
-against-

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK; MARIST
BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS a/k/a MARIST
BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS, INC. a/k/a THE
MARIST BROTHERS a/k/a THE MARIST
BROTHERS PROVINCE OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA; SAINT PETER AND SAINT MARY
OF THE ASSUMPTION, AND SAINT PETER'S
GRAMMAR SCHOOL,

Plaintiff designates Queens
County as the place of trial.

The basis of venue is:
*Defendant Marist Brothers
Of The Schools' place of
business*

70-20 Juno Street
Forest Hills, New York
11375

Defendants,

County of Queens

X

To the above named Defendants:

You are hereby summoned to answer the complaint in this action, and to serve a copy of your answer, or, if the complaint is not served with this summons, to serve a notice of appearance on the Plaintiff's attorneys within twenty days after the service of this summons, exclusive of the day of service, where service is made by delivery upon you personally within the state, or, within 30 days after completion of service where service is made in any other manner. In case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the complaint.

Dated: New York, New York
October 7, 2019

MARK DAVID SHIRIAN P.C.

By:



MARK D. SHIRIAN, ESQ.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

THOMAS MULHALL

228 East 45th Street, Suite 1700B

New York, New York 10017

(212) 931-6530

To:

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK
1011 First Avenue
New York, NY 10022

MARIST BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS a/k/a MARIST BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS, INC. a/k/a THE MARIST BROTHERS a/k/a THE MARIST BROTHERS PROVINCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
70-20 Juno Street
Forest Hills, New York 11375

SAINT PETER AND SAINT MARY OF THE ASSUMPTION
115 Broadway
Haverstraw, NY 10927

SAINT PETER'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL
115 Broadway
Haverstraw, NY 10927

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF QUEENS

X

THOMAS MULHALL,

Plaintiff,

Index No.:
Date Purchased:

-against-

VERIFIED COMPLAINT

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK; MARIST
BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS a/k/a MARIST
BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS, INC. a/k/a THE
MARIST BROTHERS a/k/a THE MARIST
BROTHERS PROVINCE OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA; SAINT PETER AND SAINT MARY
OF THE ASSUMPTION, AND SAINT PETER'S
GRAMMAR SCHOOL,

Defendants.

X

From approximately the years of 1970 and 1972, Brother Damian Galligan, F.M.S. ("Br. Galligan") sexually exposed himself and abused Plaintiff as a child. While the abuse occurred, Defendants were generally negligent, they negligently employed Br. Galligan, and gave him access to children, including Plaintiff. This lawsuit arises out of Plaintiff's significant damages from that sexual abuse, described below. Plaintiff, by and through Plaintiff's attorneys, states and alleges as follows:

PARTIES**A. Plaintiff**

1. At all times material to this Complaint, Plaintiff was a student at St. Peter's Grammar School in Haverstraw, New York. At all times material, Plaintiff resided in the State of New York and presently resides in Queens County, City and State of New York.

B. Defendants

2. Whenever reference is made to any Defendant entity, such reference includes that entity, its parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, and successors. In

addition, whenever reference is made to any act, deed, or transaction of any entity, the allegation means that the entity engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of the entity's business or affairs.

3. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese of New York ("Archdiocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York with its principal place of business at 1011 First Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

4. The Archdiocese was created in approximately 1850. Later, the Archdiocese created a corporation called the Archdiocese of New York to conduct some of its affairs. The Archdiocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as the organization managed, maintained, and controlled St. Peter's School.

5. The Archdiocese has several programs that seek out the participation of children including, but not limited to, schools and other educational programs. The Archdiocese, through its officials, has complete control over those activities and programs involving children. The Archdiocese has the power to appoint, train, supervise, monitor, remove, and terminate each and every person working with children within the Archdiocese.

6. At all times material, Defendant Marist Brothers of the Schools a/k/a Marist Brothers of the Schools, Inc. a/k/a The Marist Brothers a/k/a The Marist Brothers Province of the United States of America ("Marist Brothers") was and continues to be a religious order of priests and brothers affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church with its United States headquarters and principal place of business located at 70-20 Juno Street,

Forest Hills, New York 11375.

7. The Marist Brothers are an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York. The provincial is the top official of the Marist Brothers and is given authority over all matters dealing with the Marist Brothers as a result of his position. The Marist Brothers function as a business by engaging in numerous revenue-producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services.

8. The Marist Brothers have several programs that seek out the participation of children, including but not limited to schools and other educational programs. The Marist Brothers, through its officials, have complete control over those activities and programs involving children. The Marist Brothers have the power to appoint, train, supervise, monitor, remove and terminate each and every person working with children within the Marist Brothers.

9. At all times material, Defendant Saint Peter and Saint Mary of the Assumption ("St. Peter's") was and continues to be an organization authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York, with its principal place of business at 115 Broadway, Haverstraw, New York 10927. Defendant St. Peter's includes, but is not limited to, the St. Peter's corporation and any other organizations and/or entities operating under the same or similar name with the same or similar principal place of business.

10. At all times material, St. Peter's was and continues to be under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. Defendant St. Peter's includes any school affiliated with St. Peter's,

including St. Peter's School. At all times material, St. Peter's School was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendants St. Peter's, the Marist Brothers, and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. At all times material, Defendants St. Peter's, Archdiocese and Marist Brothers owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled St. Peter's Grammar School.

11. At all times material, Saint Peter's Grammar School ("St. Peter's School") was an organization authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York, with its principal place of business at 21 Ridge Street, Haverstraw, NY 10927. Upon information and belief, St. Peter's School dissolved in or around 2015. Upon information and belief, St. Peter's School ceased ordinary business operations in or around 2015.. St. Peter's includes, but is not limited to, the St. Peter's School corporation and any other organizations and/or entities operating under the same or similar name with the same or similar principal place of business

12. At all times material, St. Peter's was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Archdiocese and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York.

13. For purposes of this Complaint, Defendants St. Peter's School and St. Peter's are referred to collectively as "School."

JURISDICTION

14. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 301 as Defendants' principal places of business are in New York and because the unlawful conduct complained of herein occurred in New York.

15. Venue is proper pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 503 in that Queens County is the principal place of business of Defendant Marist Brothers and Plaintiff is a resident of Queens County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**A. Background**

16. The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and, by implication these Defendants, have been aware of the serious problem of clergy sexual abuse of children since at least the 1800s.

17. Further, Roman Catholic Church officials, including these Defendants, have used their power and influence to prevent victims and their families from disclosing allegations of abuse.

18. Additionally, Plaintiff's relationship to Defendants and Br. Galligan, as a vulnerable child and student at School was one in which Plaintiff was subject to the ongoing influence of Defendants and Br. Galligan, Plaintiff's abuser.

B. Specific Allegations

19. At all times material, Br. Galligan was a Roman Catholic cleric employed by the Archdiocese, Marist Brothers, and School ("Defendants"). Br. Galligan remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants.

20. Defendants placed Br. Galligan in positions where he had access to and worked with children as an integral part of his work.

21. Plaintiff was raised in a Catholic family and attended School in New York, in the Archdiocese. Plaintiff came in contact with Br. Galligan as an agent and representative of Defendants, and at St. Peter's Grammar School.

22. Plaintiff, as a youth, participated in activities at School. Plaintiff, therefore, developed great admiration, trust, reverence, and respect for the Roman Catholic Church, including Defendants and their agents, including Br. Galligan. During and through these activities, Plaintiff, as a minor and vulnerable child, was dependent on Defendants and

Br. Galligan. Defendants had custody of Plaintiff and accepted the entrustment of Plaintiff and, therefore, had responsibility for Plaintiff and authority over Plaintiff.

23. From approximately 1970 and 1972, when Plaintiff was approximately 12 and 14 years old, respectively Br. Galligan engaged in unpermitted sexual exposure and sexual contact with Plaintiff.

COUNT I: NEGLIGENCE

24. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-23 above.

25. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care to protect the Plaintiff from injury.

26. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty of care because each Defendant had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

27. Defendants also had a duty arising from the special relationship that existed with Plaintiff, Plaintiff's parents, and other parents of young, innocent, vulnerable children in the Archdiocese of New York to properly train and supervise its clerics. This special relationship arose because of the high degree of vulnerability of the children entrusted to their care. As a result of this high degree of vulnerability and risk of sexual abuse inherent in such a special relationship, Defendants had a duty to establish measures of protection not necessary for persons who are older and better able to safeguard themselves.

28. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because each Defendant also had a special relationship with Br. Galligan.

29. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because they solicited youth and parents for participation in their youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in their programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted their facilities and programs as being safe for children; held

their agents, including Br. Galligan, out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with their agents; and/or encouraged their agents, including Br. Galligan, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

30. By accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff, Defendants established an *in loco parentis* relationship with Plaintiff and in so doing, owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from injury. Further, Defendants entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and by Defendants undertaking the care and guidance of the Plaintiff, Defendants also held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff. Further, Defendants, by holding themselves out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendants, through its employees, exploited this power over Plaintiff and, thereby, put the minor Plaintiff at risk for sexual abuse.

31. By establishing and/or operating the Archdiocese and School, accepting the minor Plaintiff as a participant in their programs, holding their facilities and programs out to be a safe environment for Plaintiff, accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff *in loco parentis*, and by establishing a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff, Defendants entered into an express and/or implied duty to properly supervise Plaintiff and provide a reasonably safe environment for children, who participated in their programs. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from foreseeable dangers. Defendants had the duty to exercise the same degree of care over minors under their control as a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

32. By establishing and operating the Archdiocese and School, which offered educational programs to children and which may have included a school, and by accepting

the enrollment and participation of the minor Plaintiff as a participant in those educational programs, Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from generally foreseeable dangers.

33. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendants invited Plaintiff onto their property and Br. Galligan posed a dangerous condition on Defendants' property.

34. Each Defendant breached its duties to Plaintiff. Defendants failed to use ordinary care in determining whether their facilities were safe and/or determining whether they had sufficient information to represent their facilities as safe. Defendants' breach of their duties include, but are not limited to: failure to protect Plaintiff from a known danger, failure to have sufficient policies and procedures in place to prevent child sex abuse, failure to properly implement policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to ensure that policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children of the risks of child sex abuse, failure to investigate risks of child molestation, failure to properly train the employees at institutions and programs within Defendants' geographical confines, failure to train the minors within Defendants' geographical confines about the dangers of sexual abuse by clergy, failure to have any outside agency test their safety procedures, failure to protect the children in their programs from child sex abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the institutions, programs, leaders and people as safe, failure to train their employees properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees, failure by relying upon mental health professionals, and/or failure by relying on people who claimed that they could treat child molesters.

35. Defendants also breached their duty to Plaintiff by failing to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of the risk that Br. Galligan posed and the risks of child sexual abuse in Catholic institutions. They also failed to warn them about any of the knowledge that Defendants had about child sexual abuse.

36. Defendants additionally violated a legal duty by failing to report known and/or suspected abuse of children by Br. Galligan and/or its other agents to the police and law enforcement.

37. Prior to the sexual abuse of Plaintiff, Defendants learned or should have learned that Br. Galligan was not fit to work with children. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and/or employees, became aware, or should have become aware of Br. Galligan's propensity to commit sexual abuse and of the risk to Plaintiff's safety. At the very least, Defendants knew or should have known that they did not have sufficient information about whether or not their leaders and people working at School and other Catholic institutions within the Archdiocese of New York were safe.

38. Defendants knew or should have known that there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Archdiocese. At the very least, Defendants knew or should have known that they did not have sufficient information about whether or not there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Archdiocese.

39. Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had numerous agents who had sexually molested children. Defendants knew or should have known that child molesters have a high rate of recidivism. They knew or should have known that there was a specific danger of child sex abuse for children participating in their youth programs.

40. However, despite this knowledge, Defendants negligently deemed that Br. Galligan was fit to work with children; and/or that any previous suitability problems Br. Galligan had were fixed and cured; and/or that Br. Galligan would not sexually molest children; and/or that Br. Galligan would not injure children.

41. Defendants' actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff. As a vulnerable child participating in the programs and activities Defendants offered to minors, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim. Additionally, as a vulnerable child who Br. Galligan had access to through Defendants' facilities and programs, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim.

42. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants.

COUNT II: NEGLIGENT TRAINING AND SUPERVISION OF EMPLOYEES

43. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-42 above.

44. At all times material, Br. Galligan was employed by Defendants and was under each Defendant's direct supervision, employ, and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. Br. Galligan engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of his employment with Defendants and/or accomplished the sexual abuse by virtue of his job-created authority.

45. Defendants had a duty, arising from their employment of Br. Galligan, to ensure that he did not sexually molest children.

46. Further, Defendants owed a duty to train and educate employees and administrators and establish adequate and effective policies and procedures calculated

to detect, prevent, and address inappropriate behavior and conduct between clerics and children.

47. Defendants were negligent in the training, supervision, and instruction of their employees. Defendants failed to timely and properly educate, train, supervise, and/or monitor their agents or employees with regard to policies and procedures that should be followed when sexual abuse of a child is suspected or observed. Defendants were additionally negligent in failing to supervise, monitor, chaperone, and/or investigate Br. Galligan and/or in failing to create, institute, and/or enforce rules, policies, procedures, and/or regulations to prevent Br. Galligan's sexual abuse of Plaintiff. In failing to properly supervise Br. Galligan, and in failing to establish such training procedures for employees and administrators, Defendants failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

48. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants in the training and/or supervising of its employees.

COUNT III: NEGLIGENT RETENTION OF EMPLOYEES

49. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-48 above.

50. At all times material, Br. Galligan was employed by Defendants and was under each Defendant's direct supervision, employ, and control when he committed the wrongful acts alleged herein.

51. Defendants negligently retained Br. Galligan with knowledge of Br. Galligan's propensity for the type of behavior which resulted in Plaintiff's injuries in this action. Defendants failed to investigate Br. Galligan's past and/or current history of sexual abuse

and, through the exercise of reasonable diligence, should have known of Br. Galligan's propensity for child sexual abuse. Defendants should have made an appropriate investigation of Br. Galligan and failed to do so. An appropriate investigation would have revealed the unsuitability of Br. Galligan for continued employment and it was unreasonable for Defendants to retain Br. Galligan in light of the information they knew or should have known.

52. Defendants negligently retained Br. Galligan in a position where he had access to children and could foreseeably cause harm which Plaintiff would not have been subjected to had Defendants taken reasonable care.

53. In failing to timely remove Br. Galligan from working with children or terminate the employment of Br. Galligan, Defendants failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

54. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants in the retention of its employees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing causes of action, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants in an amount that will fully and fairly compensate Plaintiff for Plaintiff's injuries and damages and for any other relief the Court deems appropriate. The amount of damages sought in this Complaint exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable. Pursuant to §4 of the New York Child Victims Act, Plaintiff is entitled to a trial preference.

Dated: New York, New York
October 7, 2019

MARK DAVID SHIRIAN P.C.

By:



MARK D. SHIRIAN, ESQ.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
THOMAS MULHALL
228 East 45th Street, Suite 1700B
New York, New York 10017
(212) 931-6530

ATTORNEY'S VERIFICATION BY AFFIRMATION

Mark D. Shirian, an attorney duly admitted to practice before the Courts of the State of New York, affirms the following to be true under the penalties of perjury:

I am an attorney at **MARK DAVID SHIRIAN P.C.**, attorneys of record for Plaintiff, **THOMAS MULHALL** I have read the annexed **VERIFIED COMPLAINT** and know the contents thereof, and the same are true to my knowledge, except those matters therein which are stated to be alleged upon information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true. My belief, as to those matters therein not stated upon knowledge, is based upon facts, records, and other pertinent information contained in my files.

The reason I make the foregoing affirmation instead of the Plaintiff is because Plaintiff is not presently in the county wherein the attorneys for the Plaintiff maintain their offices.

Dated: New York, New York
October 7, 2019



Mark David Shirian

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF QUEENS

Index No.

THOMAS MULHALL,

Plaintiff,

-against-

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK;
MARIST BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS a/k/a
MARIST BROTHERS OF THE SCHOOLS, INC. a/k/a
THE MARIST BROTHERS a/k/a THE MARIST BROTHERS PROVINCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; SAINT PETER AND SAINT MARY OF THE
ASSUMPTION, AND SAINT PETER'S GRAMMAR SCHOOL,

Defendants.

SUMMONS & VERIFIED COMPLAINT

MARK DAVID SHIRIAN P.C.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

THOMAS MULHALL

228 East 45th Street, Suite 1700B
New York, New York 10017
(212) 931-6530

TO:

Service of a copy of the within is hereby admitted.

Dated:

Attorneys for

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, the presentation of **SUMMONS & VERIFIED COMPLAINT** and the contentions therein are not frivolous as defined in Subsection (c) of Section 130-1.1 of the Rules of the Chief Administrator (22NYCRR).

Dated: New York, New York
October 7, 2019



Mark D. Shirian Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
As Designated Above